

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in substantially the same order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are pending. Claims 1, 7, and 9 are currently amended. Support for these amendments is found, for example, in the U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/200,403, p. 19, line 13 to p. 20., line 24, which is incorporated into the current application at paragraph 0078. No claims are canceled. No claims are added. No new matter has been added.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,785,704 to McCanne et al. (hereinafter "McCanne.2")

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,415,323 to McCanne et al. (hereinafter "McCanne") in view of McCanne.2.

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,314,088 to Yamano et al. (hereinafter "Yamano").

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. In particular, the Office Action states that "it seems that an anycast address is a unicast address" (emphasis

added), so resolving an anycast address to a unicast address would be gratuitous. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the specification provides sufficient support to show that resolving an anycast address to a unicast address is not “gratuitous” within the scope of the claims.

In particular, the present application includes a description of anycast and unicast addresses. Although anycast addresses may be related to unicast addresses, the present application provides a detailed explanation of resolving an anycast address to a unicast address. See paragraphs 0075 and 0077-0079; see also U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/200403, filed April 28, 2000, p. 18, line 14 to p. 20, lines 24, and figures 4-6 (explaining the anycast address resolution protocol (AARP)), which is incorporated by reference in the present application.

Given the depth of explanation provided in the specification and drawings of the current application, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, 3-9, and 11-14 are not indefinite. If the Examiner refuses to withdraw this rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a reference or some other evidence to support the assertion that “it seems that an anycast address is a unicast address” and that resolving an anycast address to a unicast address would be gratuitous. Additionally, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner explain the Office Action’s assertion that the prior art discloses the relevant limitation, if such limitation is gratuitous.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne.2. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claims.

CLAIMS 1 AND 3-6

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne.2. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference because McCanne.2 does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method, comprising:
receiving, at an information object repository, a request for an information object at an address identified by a uniform resource locator (URL);
mapping the URL to a corresponding anycast address for the information object;
resolving the anycast address for the information object to a unicast address for the information object, wherein resolving the anycast address comprises **sending an anycast resolution query according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP)**; and
obtaining a copy of the information object at the corresponding unicast address.
(Emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits McCanne.2 fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim. In particular, McCanne.2 does not disclose sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). McCanne.2 merely states that server technology can be extended with “rules” for how to resolve a content request. Also, a “new URL format” could be defined. The mere assertion that rules and formats could be implemented to resolve a content request are insufficient to disclose the details of the limitation recited in the claim. In particular, the ambiguous reference of McCanne.2 does not disclose sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).

In contrast, claim 1 recites “sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).” For the reasons stated above, McCanne.2 fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1. In particular, McCanne.2 does not disclose sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). Given that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Given that claims 3-6 depends from independent claim 1, which is patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-6 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3-6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

CLAIMS 7-9 AND 11-14

Claims 7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by McCanne.2 for similar reasons to the rejection of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 9 are patentable over the cited reference because McCanne.2 does not disclose all of the limitations of the claim. Claims 7 and 9, as amended, recite the limitation “to send an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP).” While any interpretation of claim 7 or claim 9 is dependent only the language of the claim, and not on the language of each other or other claims, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7 and 9 are patentable at least for similar reasons are described above. Namely, McCanne.2 does not disclose the limitation to send and anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Given that claim 8 depends from claim 7 and claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 9, which are patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 8 and 11-14 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne in view of McCanne.2. Additionally, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 3-9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCanne in view of Yamano. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections because the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claims.

McCanne, like McCanne.2, fails to disclose the limitation sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). McCanne merely mentions stateful anycasting (col. 10, lines 36-43), which is limited use of anycasting in redirections service. However McCanne does not disclose how stateful anycasting is implemented. McCanne also describes some

communications between the client and the ARN (col. 16, lines 9-12 and 27-29), but such communications are not related to an anycast resolution query. Therefore, McCanne, does not disclose sending an anycast resolution query to the anycast address according to an anycast address resolution protocol (AARP). Yamano does not cure the absence of disclosure by McCanne and McCanne.2 with regard to the claimed limitations.

Given that the cited references fail to disclose all of the limitations of the claim, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 7, and 9 are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn. Given that claims 3-6, 8, and 11-14 depend from independent claims 1, 7, and 9, which are patentable over the cited reference, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 3-6, 8, and 11-14 are also patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3-6, 8, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the rejections and objections have been overcome. If the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Marina Portnova at (408) 720-8300.

If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 3/27/06

M. Portnova
Marina Portnova
Reg. No. 451750

12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300